UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/973,153	10/09/2001	Viswanathan Lakshmanan	01-372	5605

7590 06/29/2005

LSI Logic Corporation
M/S D-106
1551 McCarthy Boulevard
Milpitas, CA 95035

EXAMINER	
KENDALL, CHUCK O	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2192	

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/973,153	LAKSHMANAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chuck Kendall	2192	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 April 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 04/19/2005 has been entered.

2. Regarding claims 1,11,16 and 20 have been amended and claims 1 – 20 are still pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1,10,11,16 and 20 recites the limitation "relevant include files and calculation files in last paragraph of each claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Croix US 2002/0100034 A1 in view of Jammes et al. USPN 6,484,149 B1 and further in view of Ratzlaff et al USPN 6,766,506 B1.

Regarding claims 1, Croix discloses a server configured to receive a request for an Open Library Architecture Delay and Power Calculation Module and produce the Open Library Architecture Delay and Power Calculation Module in response to the request (col. 4, [0046 – 0048]) and wherein DCL/DPCM data for a specific memory configuration is created (0073, see "create a single shared OLA compiled library. The single shared OLA-enabled compiled library is a binary executable file that contains function, properties, and the alike for providing a capability to compute delay and power". Although Croix doesn't expressly disclose said server configured to create a Delay Calculation Language memory module based on the request, Croix does mention storing application function pointers in the OLA enabled compiled library (col. 4, [0047]).

However, Jammes in an analogous art discloses an Add Branch routine which allocates memory for new nodes and creates pointers, (21:25 – 30). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to combine Croix and Jammes because, creating or generating memory and or memory locations enables the system to store based on specific requests.

Although the combination of Croix and Jammes doesn't explicitly disclose where said user interface configured to invoke a compiler to compile C-source to create the Open Library Architecture Delay and Power Calculation Module, wherein Delay Calculation Language side files are created which are used during the compilation with information on relevant include files and calculation files, Croix does disclose in Column: 4, section [0043] that the OLA (Open Library Architecture) can make a call to an OLA library (include file) which allows dynamically executed content and Croix also shows in 5, [section 0050] linking the OLA and DPCM(Delay and Power Calculation Module).

However, Ratzlaff in an analogous prior art and in a similar configuration discloses a interconnect model compiler and a compiler plug which can evaluate an internal format (i.e. C source code) which is used to support an OLA which is used with the DPCM (4:65 – 5:15) and further states in 6: 10 – 20, that any structural language can be read as long as it has a plug in. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Croix, James and Ratzlaff because, it would have enabled the system to be able to invoke C-source programs or other languages and hence make the system more compatible.

Regarding claim 2, a server as defined in claim 1, wherein said server is configured to compile the Delay Calculation Language memory into an intermediate form, and is configured to compile the intermediate form into the Open Library Architecture Delay and Power Calculation Module (Croix, section 0047, see compilation and runtime process, Examiner understands the compilation process to inherently yield intermediate code].

Regarding claim 3, a server as defined in claim 2, wherein the intermediate form is C- source (see Croix, 0052, for C++).

Regarding claim 4, a server in claim 1, where the server is configured such that the Open Library Architecture Delay and Power Calculation Module is downloadable (Croix, 0050, see DPCM loader and across applications).

Regarding claim 5, a server as defined in claim 1, wherein the server is configured to receive a request which specifies the configurations and types of memories for which an Open Library Architecture Delay and Power Calculation Module is needed (Croix, see section 0047 and 0048).

Regarding claim 6, Croix discloses all the claimed limitations as applied in claim 1 above. Croix doesn't explicitly disclose a Common Gateway Interface/Practical Extraction and Report Language Script, which is configured to process the request, although he does disclose an OLA. However, Jammes in an analogous art discloses A

CGI (Common Gateway Interface), which he notes is a standard interface which a Web Server uses to interact with external programs (7:40-45). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to combine Croix and Jammes because, it would enable a Web Server to better efficiently interact with external programs.

Regarding claim 7, James further discloses per rejection in claim 6 a server as defined in claim 1, further comprising Common Gateway Interface/Practical Extraction and Report Language Script which is configured to process the request (Jammes, 7: 40 – 43).

Regarding claim 8, a server as defined in claim 7, wherein the Common Gateway Interface/Practical Extraction and Report Language Script is configured to process the request by sourcing necessary environment variables, running a memory generation too to create Delay Calculation Language memory Modules, invoking a compiler to compile the Delay Calculation Language memory modules (Croix, section 0047, see compilation)

Regarding claim 9, a server as defined in claim 7, wherein the Common Gateway Interface/Practical Extraction and Report Language Script is configured to create Delay Calculation Language side files which are used during the compilation with information relevant include files and calculation files (Croix, section 0047, see DPCM).

Regarding claim 10, which cites similarly to previously discussed claim see rationale in claim 1.

Regarding claim 11, which cites similarly to previously discussed claim see rationale in claim 1.

Regarding claim 12, a user interface as defined in claim 11, further comprising a library of templates, which the memory generation tool uses to create the Delay Calculation Language model (Croix, 0047).

Regarding claim 13, Croix discloses all the claimed limitations as applied in claim 11 above. Although Croix discloses direct interfaces using TCP/IP and a Delay Calculation model (0047, also see 0053) Croix doesn't expressly disclose, wherein the user interface is configured to create a Hyper Text Markup Language file based on the Delay Calculation model. However, James does disclose a Web server 106 in 8: 15 as well as utilizing HTML 8:15 – 20, also see (Jammes, FIG.1, 126). Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to combine Croix and Jammes because, HTML is a standard coding convention used by Web servers 7:15.

Regarding claim 14, James further discloses per rejection in claim 13 a user interface as defined in claim 13, wherein said Hyper Text Markup Language file is configured to provide selectability of memory configurations and types (Jammes 18: 25 – 40).

Regarding claim 15, a user interface as defined in claim 11, wherein the user interface is configured such that an Open Library Architecture Delay and Power Calculation Module based on the request is downloadable (Croix, 0050, see DPCM loader and across applications).

Regarding claim 16, the method version of claim 1, see rationale as previously discussed above.

Regarding claim 17, the method version of claim 3, see rationale as previously discussed above.

Regarding claim 18, a method as defined in claim 6, further comprising using a memory generation tool to create a delay calculation language model, and having the user interface generate the request based on the Delay Calculation Language model (Croix, section 0047, see DPCM).

Regarding claim 19, a method as defined in claim 16, further comprising using a library of templates to create the Delay Calculation Language model (see Croix, section 0045 – 0048see DPCM, and OLA library).

Regarding claim 20, the system version of claim 1, see rationale as previously discussed above.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chuck Kendall whose telephone number is 571-272-3698. The examiner can normally be reached on 10:00 am - 6:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam can be reached on 571-272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ck.

WEI Y. ZHEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER